



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/415,205	10/12/1999	CHIAKI IGARASHI	Q56197	4491

7590

04/28/2003

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

GARY, ERIKA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2681

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S.I

51

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/415,205

Applicant(s)

IGARASHI, CHIAKI

Examiner

Erika A. Gary

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4 and 6-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art cited in the previous Office Action, Hachimura, US Patent Number 6,327,477 (hereinafter Hachimura), in view of Sotek et al., WO 97/38370 (hereinafter Sotek and referring to US Patent Number 6,189,059 for translated US equivalent).

Regarding independent claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 12, Hachimura discloses a master and a plurality of slave units in which the master communicates with the plurality of slave units and contains a memory which stores terminating/transmitting processor, a call-end processor, and a call processor and an operational controller for supervising wireless connection and disconnection between the master and slave. Hachimura teaches both management of wireline and wireless link disconnect [col. 3: line 55 – col. 4: line 4]. Hachimura further discloses detecting an on hook and off hook condition of a telephone set connected to the slave unit, wherein a line connection request signal is sent and confirmed to the master unit [col. 4: lines 14-57].

What Hachimura does not specifically disclose is that the unit IDs are preliminarily registered in the slave and master units, wherein IDs are matched for

confirmation of assignment of vacant communication channels to the slave unit.

However, Sotek teaches this limitation [col. 2: lines 15-23, 34-38].

Hachimura and Sotek are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, communications systems with master and slave stations. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hachimura to include Sotek. The motivation for this modification would have been to specifically point out that the call processing in the master unit of Hachimura would have included preliminary registration of the slave units which comprises storing a plurality of unit identifications for the purpose of allowing detection, notification, and confirmation of communicable slave units for the processing of incoming calls as taught by Hachimura [col. 4: lines 14-57].

Regarding claim 7, Hachimura and Sotek disclose the limitations of claim 6. Hachimura is further evidence of the radio telephone system wherein when a second telephone set is hooked off to make a telephone call while the first telephone is in communication, a line connection request and the unit ID are transmitted on the control channel and the line connection for the first telephone set is executed [col. 4: lines 14-57].

Regarding claim 8, Hachimura and Sotek disclose the limitations of claim 6. Hachimura is further evidence of the radio telephone system wherein when a second telephone is hooked off to discontinue its communication in the state that both the first and second telephone sets are in communication, a communication off request is transmitted from the second telephone set to the master telephone set; and in response

to receipt of the communication off signal, the master telephone set transmits a communication off signal to the second telephone set, thus ending the communication and restore the second telephone set to the standby state [fig. 3].

Regarding claim 9, Hachimura and Sotek disclose the limitations of claim 6. Hachimura is further evidence of the radio telephone system wherein when the first telephone set is hooked on, a communication off request is transmitted from the first telephone set to the master telephone set; and in response to receipt of the communication off request, the master telephone set transmits a communication off signal to the first telephone set thus ending the communication and restores the telephone set to the standby state [fig. 3: steps 308-315].

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Hachimura and Sotek disclose the limitations of claim 10. Hachimura further discloses wherein the master telephone set sends out via the communication channel an instruction to ring the bell to the slave telephone set [col. 4: lines 66-67].

2. Claims 4/1 and 4/2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachimura and Sotek in view of previously relied upon prior art, Wakayama, US Patent Number 6,212,221 (hereinafter Wakayama).

Regarding claim 4, Hachimura and Sotek disclose the radio telephone system according to claims 1 and 2. Hachimura does not specifically disclose the radio telephone, wherein each slave telephone set is capable of utilizing both analog and digital communication.

In a similar field of endeavor, Wakayama discloses a radio telephone system wherein each slave telephone set is capable of using both analog and digital communication [col. 8: lines 49-57].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Hachimura and Sotek to include both analog and digital communication for the purpose of communicating voice and/or data to the master unit.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art has not been found that suggests or renders obvious the radio telephone system further disclosing wherein a plurality of unit IDs registered in each slave telephone set are registered in a plurality of master telephone sets.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 5, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the previous Office Action did not identify the grounds of rejection for claim 9. The Examiner disagrees in that this rejection can be found on page 5 of the Office Action. If the Applicant was really referring to claim 8, claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 112 for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis

Art Unit: 2681

for "the second telephone set" when there was no mention of a second telephone set in the preceding claims. Claim 8 now stands rejected under Hachimura in view of Sotek.

Regarding independent claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 12, Applicant argues that Sotek does not disclose a plurality of IDs preliminary registered in each slave set. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and finds this teaching in column 2: lines 15-23 and 34-38. Applicant also argues the combination of Hachimura and Sotek. Again, the Examiner contends that Sotek was used as a secondary reference to show the teaching of a master station having a plurality of identification codes stored within the registered slave units such that the master station controls the plurality of slave units. Sotek is a wired example of Hachimura's teaching. It is well known in the art that functions of wired telephone systems are now being implemented in wireless telephone systems. Further, the wired example of Sotek is combined with Hachimura to indicate an obvious modification to Hachimura which specifically teaches a master unit which controls a plurality of slave units, wherein detection of on hook and off hook of the slave units is provided. Also, notification and confirmation of line request signals is provided in both the wireline and wireless environment which provides motivation for the combination.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant argues that Wakayama does not disclose a plurality of unit IDs registered in the master set. Claim 4 is now rejected under Hachimura and Sotek in view of Wakayama, as Wakayama was included to show the teaching of each slave telephone set being capable of using both analog and digital communication.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kojima, US Patent Number 5,495,520, discloses a cordless telephone system and identification code setting method therefor.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erika A. Gary whose telephone number is 703-308-0123. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 703-305-4778. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750 or to the 2600 Customer Service Office at 703-306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/415,205
Art Unit: 2681

Page 8

EAG
April 24, 2003


ERIKA GARY
PATENT EXAMINER